DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 338 778 UD 028 409

AUTHOR Swanson, Judy
TITLE Preliminary Evaluation of Office of Academic Achievement's Programs 1990-1991. Report No. 91-4.
INSTITUTION Seattle Public Schools, Wash.
PUB DATE Jul 91
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Computer Assisted Instruction; Early Childhood Education; Elementary Education; High Risk Students; Multicultural Education; Parent Participation; *Pilot Projects; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Public Schools; *School Districts; School Restructuring; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Seattle Public Schools WA

ABSTRACT

Three programs sponsored by the Seattle (Washington) public schools' Office of Academic Achievement were evaluated: the Academic Achievement Project, Early Childhood Model (ECM) Schools, and Pilot Projects. Academic Achievement projects were designed to increase the academic achievement of at-risk learners and to decrease disproportionality. The ECM is a philosophy of early childhood education organized around a set of core characteristics. There were five pilot projects: two were building-based methods for restructuring schools; one focused on oral language and multicultural history; one was a computer-aided instruction system; and another was library based and encouraged parents reading with their children. Data were collected through interviews, observations, teacher questionnaires, and score analysis. The following were the major findings: (1) change was slow and gradual; (2) ease of implementation of the pilot projects was varied; (3) some classroom attitudes began to change; (4) there were no measurable effects on achievement gains or any reduction in disproportionality; and (5) there were substantial correlations between the level of implementation and achievement gains: as the level of implementation increased, achievement gains increased. The report includes four references and a table summarizing the data. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. G. Caldwell

Seattle Public Schools
Dept. of Res., Planning and Eval.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author wishes to thank all of the schools for their cooperation with this evaluation. I am especially indebted to the Office of Academic Achievement's dedicated staff: Louise McKinney, Joan Dore, Patricia Heller, Yvonne Steinmetz, and Gretchen Lesh. They have all been extremely cooperative and receptive to feedback, making this evaluation a more productive effort.

Special acknowledgement is due Madelaine Ramey, Les Kendrick, George Sanders, and Robert Vaughan, for their technical assistance and helpful suggestions throughout the project. And finally, I want to thank Brenda Wielenga for her assistance in preparing this document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	2
Introduction	3
Evaluation Questions	6
Preliminary Results and Discussion	6
Early Childhood Model Schools	7
Pilot Projects	10
Academic Achievement Project	14
Recommendations for Future Evaluations	15
References	16
Appendix A	17

Abstract

The Office of Academic Achievement (OAA) sponsors three types of programs: The Academic Achievement Project, Early Childhood Model (ECM) Schools, and Pilot Projects. Although ECM schools existed before, the 1990-91 school year marked the beginning of a structured ECM program that provided "hands-on" services and resources to ECM schools. Training has been provided through numerous in-service workshops and the ECM liaison teachers program. The major findings are that:

--change has been a slow and gradual process, and although the implementation of the ECM core characteristics has begun in some classrooms, it has been limited.

--the ease of implementation of the five pilot projects has varied depending on the training received and the receptivity of the participating building staffs.

--attitudes and some classroom practices have begun to change,

-- to date there has been no measurable effect on achievement gains or any reduction in disproportionality.

--there were, however, substantial correlations between the level of implementation and achievement gains; as the level of implementation increased, achievement gains increased.

Future evaluations should focus on the process of implementing each of the programs, identifying both the obstacles to be overcome, and the practices that promote success.

Introduction

The Office of Academic Achievement was established during the 1988-89 school year with the dual purpose of increasing the academic achievement of all children, but especially underachieving children, and decreasing disproportionality in Seattle's elementary schools. The office has sponsored a number of projects to try to achieve these goals. Those projects represent three different categories, which operate fairly independently, although they are all consistent with the overall goals of the office. The three categories are the Academic Achievement Project, Early Childhood Model Schools, and Pilot Projects. Table 1 in the Appendix A identifies which schools have which programs.

I. The **Academic Achievement Project.** During the 1988-89 school year 22 elementary schools were invited to submit proposals to develop programs designed to increase the academic achievement of at-risk learners, and to decrease disproportionality. Eight schools received funding for a two year period to implement their proposals. The 1990 evaluation (Banks, 1990) reported that there had been no significant achievement gains made by students who participated in the Academic Achievement Programs. One school discontinued its project; the remaining seven projects were funded again for the 1990-91 school year:

Alki -- Summer Reading Program
Concord -- Staff Development in Multicultural Awareness
Cooper -- Staff Development in Reading and Math
Graham Hill -- Writing-to-Read Lab/ Classworks
Highland Park -- Extended Day Program
Madrona -- Homework Center
T.T. Minor -- Homework Center

II. **Early Childhood Model Schools (ECM)** Prior to the 1990-91 school year 22 schools had been designated ECM schools, but to a large extent many of them were ECM's "in name only." The philosophy was not understood by most schools. ECM is not a "program" per se, but rather a philosophy about what constitutes effective

early childhood education. As such the model is described by a list of core characteristics to be incorporated into the instructional practices in elementary classroooms. The core characteristics are:

-- Heterogeneous Classrooms
-- Continuous Progress
-- Frequent Monitoring
-- Flexible Grouping
-- Varied Instructional Strategies
-- Higher Order Thinking Skills
-- Integrated Language Instruction
-- Math with Manipulatives
-- Organized Classroom Management
-- Clear and Purposeful Instructional Objectives
-- Parent Involvement
-- Positive School Climate
-- Active Student Participation
-- High Expectations that All Children Can Learn

In the 1990-91 school year the number of ECM schools was increased to 29, (See Table 1). It was also the first year of a structured ECM program that provided hands-on services and resources to the school buildings. The focus of the Office of Academic Achievement (OAA) was to train teachers to incorporate the ECM Core Characteristics into their teaching, and provide them with the resources and support needed to do so. The OAA has offered numerous professional development opportunities through in-service workshops in literature-based instruction, math manipulatives, and learning styles. The OAA has also provided each ECM school with the materials needed to implement the program's objectives (i.e., math manipulatives, classroom sets of novels, thematic guide books, and other curriculum materials). To facilitate the implementation of these "new" ideas, the ECM Liaison Teachers Program was established, providing a stipend for one teacher per building. An ECM Liaison Teacher Specialist from the OAA served as a resource person to the liaison teachers, providing information, feedback, and suggestions for use in their classrooms, and

organizing opportunities for the liaison teachers to observe each other and share ideas. A second Liaison Teacher Specialist was hired in February, 1991 to organize a similar arrangement with new ECM schools that will be joining the program for the 1991-92 school year.

III. **Pilot Projects.** Five pilot projects were initiated during the 1990-91 school year in some of the ECM schools. Three of the pilot projects, Accelerated Schools, Comer Model Schools, and the Proficiency in English Program (PEP) are intended to be school-wide programs. Accelerated Schools and the Comer Model are comprehensive building-based methods for restructuring schools, while PEP focuses on only some parts of the curriculum (Oral language development, and multicultural history. The three pilot Accelerated Schools are Alki, Beacon Hill, and Muir. The three pilot Comer Model schools are Colman, High Point, and King, and the PEP program is located at King, T.T. Minor, and Rainier View.

Two of the pilot projects are designed for use in particular grades or classrooms. Acceleration 2000 is a computer-aided instruction system designed to facilitate the integration of a literature-based curriculum, "blending cooperative learning, higher-order thinking skills, exploration-discovery learning, and accelerated teaching methods." The system is designed for small group instruction. The Acceleration 2000 systems are located at Madrona, W. Woodland, and Wing Luke.

The Parent Outreach Library Program has been targeted for use in Head Start, Kindergarten, and First grade. The program provides a videotape guide and weekly check-out system for bringing new books into the home each week, with the objective to get parents involved in reading with their children. The Outreach Library was made available to the following schools: Beacon Hill, Colman, Concord, Gatzert, High Point, King, Muir, Rainier View, Van Asselt, Highland Park, and the Headstart program located at Columbia Annex.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The purpose of this study is to answer the following questions:

1) To what extent have the programs initiated by the Office of Academic Achievement been accepted and implemented in the target schools?

2) What progress has been made towards the OAA's goals of increasing academic achievement and decreasing disporportionality?

Answers to these questions have been based on interviews with principals and liaison teachers at each of the 29 ECM schools, classroom observations, in-service workshop observations, responses to a teacher questionnaire, and analysis of CAT scores.

PRELIMINARY RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Before turning to results, it is important to note that this evaluation is very much "in process." Final conclusions can not be drawn until the programs have been more fully implemented and given a chance to work. This is the first year that the ECM program has begun to influence classroom instructional practices, but it will take time for that influence to become widespread. It is also the first year for the five pilot projects. Most of this first year was spent training staff and learning about the pilot projects, and they are in various stages of beginning. Change takes time, particularly in the educational system, a system that has proven so resistant to change (Cuban, 1984). It will be important to continue to evaluate these programs as they are implemented and developed, both to evaluate their progress and facilitate their implementation. However, a final product evaluation can not be completed for 3-5 years into the project.

The results are reported in the order of priority or emphasis given to the different efforts of the Office of Academic Achievement. The major thrust of the office's work has been the development of ECM schools.

Early Childhood Model Schools.

A prerequisite to implementing the ECM core characteristics is accepting the ideas, believing in the philosophy, and a willingness to change. The receptivity of building staffs has been problematic, particularly when the decision to become an ECM school was a top-down mandate, rather than a building-based decision. In cases where it was a building decision to become an ECM school, all of the building staffs were receptive to implementing the model (N=8). In cases where the decision to become an ECM was imposed, either by the principal or by central office decision, none of the schools were receptive to implementing the ideas. In more than half of those cases (N=13), the building staffs were split. They didn't like the way the decision was made, and even though many believed in the goals of ECM, they were resistant to having the ideas imposed on them. The remaining schools (N=8) were quite resistant because they had no input into the decision. (For next year, all 12 new ECMs chose to become part of the program, which should facilitate implementation.)

Lack of initial receptivity does not make change impossible, but it does impede the process. As the year progressed, a number of schools became more accepting, and began to "buy into" many of the ECM ideas. One of the main factors that has helped to win over many staff members has been the availability of high quality in-service workshops. Participation in the in-service workshops has been strong, with 312 teachers from the 29 ECM schools attending some workshop (outside of school time). Half of the ECM's had more than 50% of their staff take advantage of at least one of the professional development opportunities, with many teachers attending multiple workshops. Feedback from attending teachers has been consistently high for literature-based instruction and math workshops, indicating that the workshops were "extremely useful," and enabled them to implement at least some of the ideas into their classroom. Workshops on learning styles, however, received mixed reviews, and

offered litttle in terms of classroom applications. The most frequent recommendations received for improving the implementation of new curricula were to provide inservice to whole staffs at building sites, and provide more follow through (i.e., use a clinical model of staff development). A progressive series of workshops were offered to school sites this year, and plans have been made to expand this format as schools have expressed a need for more extensive training.

Implementation of the ECM characteristics has been slow in part, because the effort has largely been channeled through a single teacher at each building. Although the ECM Liaison Teacher Specialist has worked with the liaison teachers to set up a "demonstration classroom" in each building, the avenues for "demonstrating" and disseminating the ideas have been limited. Only nine of the liaison teachers indicated that they had found effective avenues for sharing ideas with their colleagues, and that other teachers were beginning to change what they were doing in their classrooms. Eight liaison teachers found that some staff members were receptive to implementing new ideas, while others were not. The remaining 12 liaison teachers reported that they had not found effective ways of sharing ideas with their staff, either because they lacked confidence in their own understanding, or there were no channels available for doing so (i.e., lack of principal support, or staff receptivity). Plans have been made to extend the work of the ECM Liaison Teacher Specialists to principals in an effort to influence the entire building staff.

Given the uneven implementation of the ECM core characteristics, it is not surprising to find that overall little progress has been made toward the goals of increasing academic achievement or reducing disproportionality. Table 1 summarizes the Academic Effective Index (AEI) and Achievement Gap Index (AGI) results for each of the schools in the study. The AGI, recently developed by the Management Information Services staff, measures disproportionality reduction. A positive score indicates a reduction in the achievement gap between minority and majority students. Although the scores in Table 1 are more positive than negative, the most common situation is minor increases or decreases that can not be reliably distinguished from zero. Overall, there is no indication that the ECM program has to date had any measurable effect on achievement gains or any reduction in disproportionality at the

school level. Because the most intensive effort of the OAA was with individual teachers, a subsequent analysis explored the impact of the liaison teachers program by examining the performance of students in the ECM liaison teachers' classrooms. The achievement gains of the students in the ECM liaison teachers' classrooms were compared to the achievement gains of other students in the same grade levels in their building.[1]

Only four of the classroom comparisons showed statistically significant (t-test, $p < .05$) greater gains for the liaison teachers. While these results are disappointing, it is critical to examine the level of program implementation in each of the classrooms. Two independent judges, who had observed each liaison teacher's classroom, rated the level of implementation of the core characteristics observed in each liaison teacher's classroom with 90% agreement. Although most liaison teachers felt that they had changed their teaching as a result of the ECM training, it is important to note that even with the individual guidance received by the liaison teachers, the level of implementation in their classrooms was inconsistent, and at times quite minimal. A subsequent analysis revealed a substantial positive relationship between the level of implementation and achievement gains (Pearson Product Moment Correlations = .53 Total Reading, .40 Language, and .72 Total Math[2]).

This relationship is encouraging and suggests that when the core characteristics of the Early Childhood Model are an integral part of the classroom, they may contribute to greater levels of academic achievement. It will be important for future evaluations to examine implementation in individual classrooms to better understand the relationship between these characteristics and student achievement, and to identify both obstacles and facilitators in the implementation process. Therefore, a detailed process evaluation is recommended, with particular emphasis on those schools that are achieving results.

---

[1]Standardized change score analysis (Kenny, 1975) was used. Comparisons between study and comparison groups were limited to students for whom CAT test scores were available for both Spring 1990 and Spring 1991. This restriction reduced the sample to only 14 classes , as a number of the liaison teachers taught kindergarten or first grade.

[2]($p < .01$). The only correlation that reached statistical significance was between level of implementation and math achievement gain, but it should be noted that statistical significance is difficult to obtain with such a small sample.

PILOT PROJECTS

The **Proficiency in English Program** (PEP) was designed to increase the oral language competence and effectiveness of the linguistically different. The PEP staffs at M. L. King, T. T. Minor and Rainier View have all enthusiastically introduced the PEP program into their curriculum. The PEP Staff consists of those teachers who visited Los Angeles to observe the PEP program there, and received the PEP training. Only one school has attempted to get the entire staff involved in the program the first year, but all building staffs were offered training in July, 1991. All three schools put on demonstration lessons this spring that were well attended and well received. The most promising aspects of this program are that it addresses important skills in oral communication that have been largely overlooked in traditional school programs, and that the program is inexpensive and easy to implement.

The concerns regarding this program are first of all, the lack of an assessment tool to evaluate achievement in oral communication skills. Although widely used in the Los Angeles Public Schools, this program has never been evaluated. Second, schools will need to concentrate on integrating PEP into the rest of the curriculum with an emphasis on application of the skills learned. Finally, there is a concern that there is too great an emphasis on memorization, without a concomitant emphasis on comprehension.

Accelerated Schools was developed by Dr. Henry Levin at Stanford University. Recognizing that traditional approaches of remediation were not working, the model is designed to address the educational needs of underachieving children. The first pilot projects were initiated only four and a half years ago. Preliminary process evaluations of pilot Accelerated School sites have been quite positive, but no final product evaluations have yet been conducted. The model itself is still developing as the Stanford Group learns from its attempts to implement Accelerated Schools in numerous sites around the country. Seattle's three pilot Accelerated Schools (Muir, Beacon Hill, and Alki) have participated in two full day workshops with the Stanford

Staff, receiving an overview of Accelerated Schools and training in the process of "taking stock" and "forming a vision," and the "inquiry process." Each of the schools seems to be off to a good start, although progress has been slow, and training will continue this fall. The spring 1991 teachers' strike also took away some of the momentum that had been building.

One of the promising aspects of this program is that it is not really a program, it is a process, involving the entire school community: staff, parents, and students. It provides building staffs with a structured method for restructuring their school. The process has built-in flexibility for adapting to the needs of individual schools. It also has a built-in evaluation component, although Levin has not emphasized this aspect in the Seattle schools thus far. Another important factor is the availability of a well-written training manual (although it is still in draft form), which provides the schools with a guide from which to work.

The major concern with the implementation of Accelerated Schools is time. School staffs need time to work together-- brainstorming, doing research, planning solutions, implementing and evaluating pilot projects. The schools will need central office support (release time) to get the time needed to implement Accelerated Schools. The OAA has provided funds for some Saturday sessions. The entire staff will need training in group dynamics--especially the principals. There is also a concern that building staffs don't become over-confident. There is a tendency to think that they can do it on their own, and end up taking short cuts that undermine the process. In the next couple of years the evaluation should focus on the process of implementation, evaluating it on its fidelity to the model, both in the decision-making process and how those decisions are implemented. Throughout that period, it will also be important to assess outcomes, to evaluate the school's progress toward its goal. That evaluation should include not only test scores, but also measures of attendance, parent participation, self-esteem, satisfaction with the school, and behavior.

It is difficult to say much about the **Comer Model** Schools, as they have not really begun implementation. Several obstacles have been encountered this year, the major one being that funding for a full time counselor (Comer Facilitator) at each of the

school sites did not materialize until the end of the school year. There was also a substantial amount of resistance in some of the schools, because faculty felt that the decision to become a Comer Model School was imposed on them. In addition, the latest presenters from the Yale Child Study Center were unimpressive, and alienated some of the staff with their inability to handle questions. The three Comer facilitators did attend two training institutes at Yale, one in the fall and in the spring, and they are all optimistic that that Model can work here in Seattle. Principals also received training at Yale in the fall. The strength of the Comer Model is its focus on the social-emotional well-being of children. It does not address issues of curriculum and instruction. The model defines a governance structure that includes a school planning and management team (SPMT), a mental health team, and a parent program.

By the end of the school year, each of the schools had agreed on the makeup of their SPMT for next fall.

King received a 20 minute overview from their facilitator during a staff meeting, and participated in a group dynamics workshop. The staff appeared to be receptive, but have yet to begin the process.

Colman used the last early release day to work on team building. The discussion focused on setting goals. All staff signed up for committees for future work. Feedback from the staff was very positive.

This is a very slow process, and once again the major concern will be finding time for the staffs to work together. The OAA has provided some funds for Saturday work sessions. The Model is intentionally vague, to build in flexibility and adaptability to the needs of the individual school-- it is a building-based decision making model. This strength is also a weakness, making it difficult to implement and evaluate, because the "process" for implementing change that is the key to the Comer Model is not written down anywhere. There are no guidelines for the schools to follow, and only one person in each building has been trained in the process. Although Comer has received national recognition for the turn- around in New Haven Public Schools, the program has never been evaluated, nor has it been successfully replicated without intensive intervention from the Yale Child Study Center Team (Payne, 1991).

Acceleration 2000, the computer-aided instruction system, developed by Educational Management Group has had an unsuccessful first year. At all three pilot

sites the systems have been largely unused most of the year. Once again there was a substantial amount of resistance because building staff did not participate in the decision to implement this program. This resistance was intensified when the training received from the company's consultant was inadequate, and many technical problems with the system were encountered. Because of the cost of the system, school staffs wanted it in a location where it would be accessible to a number of classrooms; however, the logistics were difficult to work out. The system doesn't work well in whole classroom instruction; it was designed to focus instruction on flexible small group teaching.

With all of the initial problems, teachers lost interest and stopped using the system entirely, even though the technology was fascinating to the children. The last few months of the school year the company sent in a new consultant to do some crisis management. Although the second consultant was more knowledgeable, the spring strike interrupted this effort and there was little time left in the school year to start over. As a result, Educational Management Group has offered to provide services to Seattle next year free of charge, in an effort to turn the situation around. Basically, this pilot will start over next year.

There are, however, some serious issues that need to be considered when evaluating the system next year. A number of teachers and consultants found the system extremely limited, in both the amount and quality of literature used, the extremely small number of entries in the encyclopedia, and the over abundance of drill and practice, or simple recall tasks used. The advertised focus on higher-order thinking skills and cooperative learning is largely missing. An important question that needs to be answered is what can this system do that a creative teacher can't do without it? The company has yet to provide an answer. And finally, a major concern must be the cost effectiveness of this system.

The **Parent Outreach Library** is also a product of the Educational Management Group, and like Acceleration 2000 it had its share of problems, largely as a result of difficulties with the same consultant. Conceptually, this program has some real possibilities. Sets of backpacks are provided to transport books and videotape to and from school. The goal is to get parents involved in reading with their

child. The response from those who have participated has been quite positive, but participation has not been as widespread as hoped. The problems with parent participation were largely a result of the poor orientation/training provided by Educational Management Group. Misinformation from the consultant requiring that parents attend an evening training session in order for their child to participate limited the number of children involved. The program was made available to nine elementary schools, and the Head Start program located at Columbia Annex. Only one school used all the backpacks they had been provided. Most schools used only 40-45% of the materials that had been provided, and one school never implemented the program, so the materials were never used.

A parent questionnaire was sent by the evaluator to all participating parents, however, it was sent late in the school year and the response rate was extremely low. Consequently, the respondents probably represent a biased sample. Those responding rated the program above average, and felt that the program had increased both the amount of time they spent reading with their child, and their child's interest in reading. The videotapes appear to be a motivating factor in getting children and parents interested in reading together. However, the tapes do not provide sufficient direction for parents who don't already read to their children, and were condescending to parents who do. A major concern about the program is the quality of literature provided and the lack of multi-cultural images in both the books and the videotapes.

The Academic Achievement Project

Because the Academic Achievement Project targeted small populations of high-risk students, it is difficult to assess the impact of the Academic Achievement Grants without tracking the progress of the individual students participating in the programs. On the surface, however, the effects appear to be minimal.

Alki– Summer Reading Program -- There were no gains in overall reading achievement and there was an increase in the gap between majority and minority student achievement.

Concord & Cooper-- Staff Development -- To assess the impact of staff development it would be necessary to observe to the extent to which teachers were

actually implementing the ideas into their classrooms before assessing the impact on student achievement.

Graham Hill -- Writing to Read Lab/Classworks-- There were no real gains in overall reading achievement, but there was a decrease in disproportionality. There were no achievement gains in math.

Highland Park-- Extended Day Program-- There were no significant gains in reading achievement.

Madrona -- Homework Center-- There were positive gains in all areas, but there was also an increase in disproportionality in all areas.

T. T. Minor-- Homework Center--There were moderate gains in reading, but a drop in Total Language achievement.

If funding is to continue for another year, an evaluation should focus on the individual student growth of the participants.

Recommendations for Future Evaluations

To maximize what can be learned from future evaluations, two general recommendations are offered. First, the evaluation should be an in-depth process evaluation of a few schools at the extremes-- a few schools that are working well, and a few that are not. Second, given the time and money invested in the five pilot projects, it will be important to engage in in-depth process evaluations of those efforts. In both cases the evaluation should be a cooperative effort between the independent evaluator, the OAA, and the school sites, to aid the schools with program implementation and monitor the schools' progress toward their objectives.

A more detailed final evaluation report will address the concerns of the program manager, building administrators, and teachers.

References

Banks, C. A. M. (1990). Academic Achievement Program, 1989-90 Evaluation.

Cuban, L. (1984). How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms, 1890-1980. White Plains, NY: Longman, Inc.

Kenny, D. A. (1975). A quasi-experimental approach to assessing treatment effects in the nonequivalent control group design. Psychological Bulletin, 82, 345-362.

Payne, C. (1991). The Comer intervention model and school reform in Chicago: Implications of two models of change. Urban Education, 26, 8-24.

Appendix A

Table 1: Summary of Office Academic Achievement Programs: Implementation and Outcomes

School	Implementation Of ECM [1]	PEP	Accelerated Schools	COMER	Acceleration 2000	Outreach Library	Academic Ach Project	Reading Gain [2]	Language Gain	Math Gain	Reading Gap Reduced	Language Gap Reduced	Math Gap Reduced
Alki	1		X				X	0	-1	+1	-1	+1	+1
Beacon Hill	3		X			X		+1	+1	+2	+2	+2	+1
Bryant	3							+1	+1	0	-2	+1	-1
Colman	4			X		X		-1	+1	+1	-1	0	+1
Concord	4					X	X	0	-1	0	0	0	-1
Cooper	3						X	0	+1	-1	+1	0	+2
Day	1							+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1
Dearborn Park	2							-1	-1	0	0	0	0
Dunlap	3							-2	0	0	+1	+1	+1
Emerson	3							-1	0	-1	+1	0	-1
Gatzert	2					X		+1	0	-1	+1	0	0
Graham Hill	2						X	0	0	0	+1	0	0
Hawthorne	2							-2	-1	-1	-1	-2	-1
Hay	3							0	0	0	0	0	-1
High Point	3			X		X		-2	-1	-2	-1	+1	+1
King	2	X		X		X		0	+1	+1	0	0	+2
Lawton	4							-1	-1	0	0	+1	0
Madrona	3				X		X	0	+2	+1	-1	-2	-1
Minor	1	X					X	+1	-2	0	0	0	0
Muir	4		X			X		+1	+1	+2	0	-1	+1
Northgate	3							0	0	0	0	+1	+2
Olympic View	3							0	0	+1	0	0	0
Rainier View	1	X				X		-2	-1	-1	+1	-1	+1

Continued.....

Appendix A Table 1: Summary of Office Academic Achievement Programs: Implementation and Outcomes

School	Implementation Of ECM[1]	PEP	Accelerated Schools	COMER	Acceleration 2000	Outreach Library	Academic Ach Project	Reading Gain[2]	Language Gain	Math Gain	Reading Gap Reduced	Language Gap Reduced	Math Gap Reduced
Rogers	2							0	+1	0	+1	0	0
Sacajawea	NA							0	+1	-1	0	0	+1
Van Asselt	2					X		-1	-1	0	+1	+1	0
Viewlands	3							+1	+1	+1	0	0	+1
W. Woodlands	2				X			0	0	0	+1	+1	+1
Wing Luke	3				X			0	+1	0	+1	2	+2
Highland Park	NA					X	X	0	-1	0	0	0	0

[1] A rating scale of 1 to 4 was used to rate degree of implementation of ECM core characteristics in only one classroom, that of the ECM liaison teacher.

4 = ECM activities are an integral part of the daily routine.
3 = Teacher is engaged in ECM activities most of the time.
2 = Teacher is engaged in ECM activities some of the time.
1 = ECM activites are rarely part of the daily routine.
NA = Not applicable. The liaison teacher at Sacajawea moved out of the district mid-year, and Highland Park is not an ECM.

[2] A rating scale of -2 to +2 was used to summarize the achievement gains (AEI scores) and the reduction in the achievement gap between majority and minority students (AGI), using Total Reading, Total Language, and Total Math scores on the CAT.

+2 = 1.5 and above (extremely large gains)
+1 = .5 to 1.49 (moderate to large gains)
0 = -.49 to +.49 (insignificant gains or declines)
-1 = -.5 to -1.49 (moderated to large declines)
-2 = -1.5 and below (extremely large declines)

The Seattle Public Schools

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Michael R. Preston, President
Kenneth H. Eastlack, Vice President
Amy Hagopian
Ellen Roe
Connie Sidles
Marilyn S. Smith
Alan Sugiyama

STRATEGIC PLANNING, EVALUATION & ASSIGNMENT
Lawrence Matsuda
Assistant Superintendent

STUDENT ASSIGNMENT SERVICES
Nan Stavnshoj
Director

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SERVICES
George Sanders
Manager

BEST COPY AVAILABLE